



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

we are humble, but we are afraid that other people that are not humble will get the start of us." The best way to secure peace is to promote every means for an amicable settlement of national controversies by some tribunal like that between individuals, so that its judgments may be sanctioned and may be enforced. The strongest sanction that can be given as the years will go by, the strongest despotism to enforce it, will be that of public opinion, which is the controlling force in our own country at this day.

Every step that you take to build other battleships and to increase the navy is another influence against settling disputes in this way. Is there no voice to be raised among us in favor of making advancement in this line of settling the world's controversies in an amicable manner? Are we to go even ahead of the other nations in our naval program? I want to call attention to this report, to show that in comparison with us France and Germany and other powers are abating in their efforts for a greater navy. It is the United States that is going ahead with the greatest rapidity, it is the United States that is saying we must be prepared for war. It is the United States that is, in effect, saying, if not in words, we are ready for war, which means that we invite war.

I want to call attention briefly, for this is a matter which presents some political considerations, to some paragraphs in the Democratic platform of 1900. That platform says:

"We are in favor of extending the republic's influence among the nations, but we believe that that influence should be extended not by force or violence, but through the persuasive power of a high and honorable example."

Now, did you mean it? Was it merely an idealistic dream on that hot day at Kansas City, or was it an expression of the policy of the party? Has that idea outlawed since 1900? If so, how long does it take for the declaration in a party platform to outlaw? Is it three years or is it four years? Will that clause, or one similar to it, be repeated by the convention in 1904? Are you going to vote for a \$100,000,000 naval bill to-day?

I say this not with any accusation that that was mere buncombe in that party platform. I say it because I think this question should be viewed from a broad standpoint of statesmanship, of what is best, not for a political party or organization. It might have been even unimportant whether we elected McKinley or Bryan in 1900, important as it was, in comparison with the great questions that might arise affecting the whole future of the republic.

Again, it was said in that platform:

"We oppose militarism."

Well, isn't a navy a part of militarism? Isn't the desire to be second in the nations of the earth with your navy an upbuilding of militarism? Has any one from that side filed a minority report on any naval bill that has come into the House within the last three or four years? If not, why were those planks in your platform there, if you were in favor of this large program? Are these declarations to be repeated when you meet at St. Louis, or wherever you meet? I say we should cry halt on every issue that looks toward war or the preparation for war. It is not that it should be a party question.

One gentleman, as I understand, opposed this bill because the material for the navy was made by the trusts. That shows how, when a man gets a fad in his mind, he will go astray. You will never successfully attack the naval program by any such popgun as that, by saying that the material that belongs in it is built by a trust. There is a broader and higher ground, and that is its effect upon the future of this great nation, upon progress here and everywhere. Shall our statesmanship, with its aspiration, its forecast of the future, look toward peace and amity and good will, or shall it look toward the bloody days of war?

For one, I want to say that I am unable to vote for a bill that carries so large an amount as this. I am unable to vote for a bill that declares that the United States, which should be the herald of peace, the leader in all great movements of civilization, is going to double and treble and quadruple its navy, all under the statement that we claim that it is in the interest of peace.

Gentlemen, you are not going to make the world think that it is in the interest of peace. I doubt whether, if you reflect upon it in your own inner consciousness, you believe that these battleships and cruisers and torpedo boats mean peace. They mean, rather, the gratification of a desire that we shall enjoy the triumphs of war on the land and the sea again.

Pacific Alliances, Disarmament and Economy.

BY GEORGE W. HOSS.

Talk about economy in military affairs finds but little response from the average American. This, for two reasons: 1. None of the millions poured out for militarism comes from direct taxes, but on the contrary, from indirect, that is, from tariff duties, sales of public bonds, taxes on vices, as the use of liquor, etc. If this war expenditure came from direct taxation as in many European governments, the case would be different. Yes, it would be seriously different, if said tax reached the European burden, whereof it is said that "every laboring man carries a soldier on his back." Though this burden exists in this country, yet happily it is not to the same degree as in Europe. The masses give it little attention, because it comes from indirect sources. 2. As a consequence, the people in general have but little or no knowledge of the enormous expenditures for military purposes. You ask a dozen men concerning these expenses, and it will be a rare case if one of them can give anything definite as to the amount.

There are additional reasons for this lack of knowledge. Not one person out of five hundred probably reads the Congressional Record, or the Report of the Secretary of War, where these amounts are accurately given. Again, the newspapers, so far as I have been able to examine, rarely give them. They go quite into detail as to what Senator So-and-so said, what Member So-and-so of the House said, and then as a rule omit every word and figure as to the amount of the appropriation.

On the other hand, if these amounts, running up into millions and hundreds of millions, were as faithfully and emphatically published as is often a three hundred or five hundred dollar appropriation by a state legislature,

the people would be better informed, and as a consequence more interested and more ready to oppose this enormous, not to say wicked, waste of the public revenues.

The friends of peace should make a positive effort to disseminate this information among the people.

Happily, pacific alliances, if I may use the word alliance in this way, are going forward with leaps and bounds. May God speed them. They are the omens of peace in the by-and-by. Within the last few months, Chile and the Argentine Republic, England and France, France and Italy, England and Italy, Holland and Denmark, have entered into such agreements; and if reports be correct, negotiations are well on the way for similar conventions between France and the four following nations: Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. The consequences of these pacific alliances will be in due time greater economy, less liability to attack, and stronger assurance. This sort of alliances tend directly to permanent peace, and when all nations shall have entered into them — that is, formed a world's pacific federation and put the Christian spirit into it — we shall be near the end of the struggle for universal and permanent peace.

There are, however, some steps between this and that. Some of these we notice briefly. There is, first, the economic view of the matter of a pacific alliance of the United States with England. Some statesmen, so called, seem to care little for the destruction and horrors of war, and so do not strive to avert it. On the other hand, they are deeply concerned in getting ready for it, and so indirectly incite to it. These statesmen ought to consider that an alliance of the kind here urged would tend to two great ends; first economy, and second, peace. Later on disarmament would also be the outcome.

Let us ally ourselves with England in an arbitration treaty, and we can then at once cease the consideration of navy bills appropriating a hundred millions, and especially such an insane bill as one proposing two and a half billions. Let us ally ourselves with England and stop all appropriations for increase of the navy. If we can't get higher in our aspirations for the sacred cause of peace, let us "stand pat" on the economic considerations. A few thousands would meet the expense of a pacific alliance with England, who is now ready for such a measure, while hundreds of millions would not prepare us to go into hostile contest with her. Peace and economy alike demand that we should enter into a pacific union with her. We have said that the sequence of a pacific alliance is disarmament. This is to be the end of the long series of movements and struggles in behalf of peace.

We are, it seems, soon to have an alliance with England, at least we ought to have. England has been ready for years to enter into such a bond. Our people, as a people, are also ready. You say, as the people rule, where is the trouble? The people rule through representatives. There is the trouble. If we fail, it will be because of the failure of our servants at Washington.

The alliance above named once consummated, it is safe to say that the two nations can at once announce to the world that they have resolved to cease to add to their armaments. This done, the twentieth century's greatest work is begun. The more surely so because France, already allied with England, will certainly follow,

and Italy allied with France will likewise follow. Thus we shall come to gradual disarmament. After that in due time will come the glorious consummation when "swords shall be beaten into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks," when cannon shall be moulded into railroad iron, and navies be turned into merchant marine and mission ships, carrying to foreign lands the Gospel of Peace and the products of industry instead of swords and slaughter.

Women Would Stop War Altogether.

BY MARY ELIZABETH BLAKE.

From a symposium in the Boston Globe.

There is a strange anomaly in the mental, or perhaps I should say the moral, equipment of woman as a sex, which leads her often to be wanting in judgment upon small matters, while she is right-minded in her estimate of larger questions. This leads me to think that now, when a more rational understanding of the subject of war has been admitted into the counsels of men, women would go still one step farther on the way of progress, and put a stop to it altogether. For, in spite of her reputation, she is logical; and what does she find war doing in the settlement of difficulties?

In an age that has discarded the duel between individuals with righteous indignation, it proclaims unrebuked the greater duels of nations. In a century that maintains law and order as the poor man's hope and the rich man's safeguard, it shows the longest purse and strongest arm still gaining and holding the prize. With a religion that teaches justice and charity to all, and places brotherly love next to godliness, it sets the fiercest passions of hate aflame in the hearts of humanity, and where we spend gold and effort to make sure that not one blood-stained criminal shall die without having his uttermost right to life vindicated, it dooms hundreds of thousands to torture and slaughter.

Can women ignore these appalling incongruities? Can they close their eyes, no matter what the questions of state or pressure of circumstance, to a solution that does not solve, and a reckoning that only goes on increasing with time until another turn of fortune's wheel brings about another cataclysm of horror? Can she see the French child taught hatred of the German and the duty of revenge, even in his school songs, and imagine that the catastrophe of Sedan settled the question of territorial rights between the Gaul and the Teuton? Or believe that England's grip on the Transvaal is anything more than the clutch of the robber on the throat of his victim, or that it will hold if ever that victim becomes the stronger? Does war, in fact, ever settle the score of right and wrong, which is a moral argument — or only that of material advantage and stronger force, which is no settlement at all? And can woman, farther removed from turmoil of politics or fever of greed, or fierce struggle for power, help seeing this?

If women had their way, I am sure war would go, as a thousand and one wrongs of less happy ages have been doomed long since. It would disappear in its turn, as filth and plague and slavery and ignorance are disappearing. Its spirit would not be kept alive with loud clamors of false glory, with dazzle of uniform and flourish of martial music. The longing of the child for blare of trumpet